

REMARKS

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to Claim 36 because the claim referred to Claim 6 which is cancelled. Claim 36 has been amended to refer to Claim 33. Accordingly, it is believed that the objection is resolved.

35 USC 103(a): Claims 41 and 42

The Examiner rejected Claims 41 and 42 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0033625 (Ninomiya et al.) in view of US 2002/0106018 (D'Luna et al.) and further in view of US 6,904,079 (Hoffmann et al.).

Claim 41

Claim 41 has been amended to recite that the logic system is "arranged to reroute the received data to a receiving apparatus without passing the received data through the adaptive filter when a pilot symbol has been detected". In the reasons for the allowability of Claims 30 and 37 on page 8, paragraph 10, of the Official Action, the Examiner stated that the feature of "passing the stream of received data to a receiving apparatus without first passing the received data through the adaptive filter when a pilot symbol is received" is not disclosed by the cited references. Because that feature is not described or suggested by the cited references, Claim 41 should be allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as Claims 30 and 37.

Claim 42

Claim 42 depends from Claim 41 and thus, includes all of the features of Claim 41. Therefore, Claim 42 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 41.

35 USC 103(a): Claims 43 to 45

The Examiner rejected Claims 43, 44, and 45 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ninomiya et al., D'Luna et al., and Hoffman et al., as applied to Claims 41 and 42 and further in view of US 2002/0196876 (Takada), US 2004/0198452 (Roy); and US 6,807,224

(Takahashi et al.), respectively. Claims 43, 44, and 45 depend from Claim 41 either directly or indirectly and thus, include all of the features set forth in Claim 41. Therefore, Claims 43, 44, and 45 are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as Claim 41.

Claims 30 to 40 and 46 to 49

The Examiner indicated that Claims 30 to 35 and 37 to 40 are allowed. The Examiner also indicated that Claim 36 would be allowable if amended to correct the incorrect claim dependency. The Examiner further indicated that Claims 46 to 49 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the features of the claims from which they depend. Claims 46 to 49 depend from Claim 41 either directly or indirectly and thus, include all of the features set forth in Claim 41. Therefore, Claims 46 to 49 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 41.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of Claims 36 and 41 to 49.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL AND SKILLMAN
A Professional Corporation
Attorneys for Applicant

By Vincent T. Pace
VINCENT T. PACE
PTO Registration No. 31,049

Tel.: 215-563-4100
Fax: 215-563-4044
e-mail: vp@ddhs.com